

Statement of Vice Admiral Dennis McGinn, USN, Retired
Member, Military Advisory Board, CNA

before the
United States Senate
Committee on Environment and Public Works
Legislative Hearing on S. 1733
Clean Energy Jobs and American Power Act
Washington, DC, October 28, 2009
9:30 a.m. 406 Dirksen Senate Office Building

Chairman Boxer, Senator Inhofe, Members of the Committee, it is an honor to appear before you today to discuss the critically important topics of energy, climate change and international security.

As I stated in previous testimony before this Committee in July of this year, I have had the privilege of serving with some of America's most distinguished and senior retired military leaders on the CNA Military Advisory Board, which produced two reports directly related to the topic of this hearing. The first examined the national security threats of climate change, and the second report analyzed the national security threats of America's current energy posture.

We are just beginning to emerge from one of the most serious global financial crises of our lifetimes. This understandably focuses our attention on near term fiscal issues. However, after several years of examining climate change and the United States' energy use, it is clear to our Military Advisory Board that our economic, energy, climate change and national security challenges are inextricably linked. And it is also clear that our past pattern of energy use is responsible, in a significant way, for our economic situation today. For these reasons, we must take a long range, comprehensive view to develop effective national policies and make real and positive changes to the ways in which we power America. A business as usual approach, continued over reliance on fossil fuels, or small, incremental steps, simply will not create the kind of future security and prosperity that the American people and our great Nation deserve. The time to act, and act boldly, is now.

Weakened economies have temporarily reduced global demand and the cost of oil. However, as this recession ends, the volatile and economically disruptive cycle of ever-higher energy prices will most surely return. Population growth and projected per capita increase in energy consumption over the next twenty years will surely make fossil fuel supply and demand curves divergent unless we change our energy posture.

This is a critical and long term international security issue – one that stretches across geographical boundaries, over political divides, and one that will be with us for decades to come. Without national leadership, enlightened policies and decisive action by our nation, fierce global competition, instability and conflict over dwindling supplies of fossil fuels and increasing global warming will be a major part of the future strategic landscape. Moving expeditiously toward clean and sustainable energy choices can lessen that danger, improve global, national and sub-national economic security and help us to confront the serious challenges of global climate change and energy insecurity.

I will now briefly discuss those challenges.

The CNA Military Advisory Board produced a report in 2007 called *National Security and the Threat of Climate Change*. Its principal conclusion is that climate change poses a serious threat to national security by acting as a "threat multiplier" for instability in some of the world's most volatile regions.

Climate change is different from traditional military threats, because it is not like having a specific enemy, well-defined response timeline, or crisis spot we're trying to handle. Climate change has the potential to create more frequent and intense natural and humanitarian disasters due to flooding, droughts, disease, and crop failure. It will magnify existing tensions in critical regions, overwhelm fragile political, economic and social structures, causing them to fracture and fail. The predictable result: much greater frequency and intensity of regional conflict and direct threats to our United States' interests and national security.

Some may be surprised to hear former generals and admirals talk about climate change and clean energy, but they shouldn't be. In the military, you learn quickly that reducing threats and vulnerabilities is essential, well before you get into harm's way. As military professionals we were trained, and learned by hard experience, to make decisions when faced with seriously threatening situations, even when they were defined by ambiguous information. But in this case, the information is not as ambiguous as some may want to believe. The science community has clear consensus in concluding that human activities are the most significant cause of climate change. There is no disagreement in peer-reviewed literature. Every major professional science society and organization in the world has issued powerful statements to this effect, including the National Academies of Sciences for every major country. The G8 and 5 other nations said in May "The need for urgent action to address climate change is now indisputable."

As military leaders, we base our decisions on trends, indicators and warnings, because waiting for 100% certainty during a crisis can be disastrous. And as we carefully consider the threat of climate change and energy to global security, these trends and warnings are clear.

Two years ago, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change – the world's leading scientific panel on climate change – including more than 200 distinguished scientists and officials from more than 120 countries, including the U.S. – predicted widening droughts in southern Europe and the Middle East, sub-Saharan Africa, the American Southwest and Mexico, and flooding that could imperil low-lying islands and the crowded river deltas of southern Asia.

Last month, global climate researchers revised those predictions, now forecasting that the planet could warm by as much as 6.3 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century even if the world's leaders fulfill their most ambitious climate pledges, a much faster and broader scale of change than the IPCC forecast just two years ago.

Their other findings include that sea level could rise by as much as six feet by 2100 instead of 1.5 feet, as the IPCC had projected, and the Arctic Sea may experience an ice-free summer by 2030, rather than by the end of the century.

Let me give you some examples of what the future could be like if we fail to adequately address the causes and effects of climate change.

In Africa, projected rising temperatures will dramatically reduce water availability, soil moisture, arable land and food production. Combined with increased extreme weather events – climate impacts will act to accelerate the destabilization of populations and governments. Climate-driven crises are already happening there. Lack of water and changing agricultural patterns are at the root of crises in Darfur and Somalia, present day examples of failed social structures and governments, leading to widespread humanitarian crises and extremism.

In South and Central America – melting glaciers in Venezuela and the Peruvian Andes will directly impact water supplies and hydroelectric power. The Peruvian plains, northeast Brazil and Mexico will experience longer and more serious droughts. Land degradation and loss of food production will hit hard in Latin America – particularly Brazil whose economy is fueled by food exports – possibly leading to social disruptions and significant migration. We need only reflect on present immigration and security challenges along the U.S. southern border to get a glimpse of what the future could hold: immigration driven not by a search for a better economic life but in search of basic needs.

In Bangladesh, the growing threat of more frequent and intense typhoons in the Bay of Bengal has the potential for wiping out essential coastal agriculture and fishing areas, just as it did in 1991 resulting in Operation Sea Angel. Greater and more prolonged coastal typhoon damage would create an unprecedented humanitarian crisis, which could drive literally millions of refugees northwest toward India in search of relief.

As the Himalayan glaciers recede, Asian nations like China, India and Pakistan will have to deal with internal and external unrest due to a much less reliable source of water from four great rivers – creating floods at some times of the year, prolonged drought during others – to meet the needs of growing populations. 40 percent of Asia's four billion people live within 45 miles of the coast – a coast that could be inundated by rising seas. Even the most modest projections of increased temperature and sea level rise include flooding and loss of significant percentages of coastal delta farmland and closely settled areas.

In the Middle East, the vast majority of highly diverse populations already depend on water sources external to their borders. A greatly increasing competition for diminishing supplies of water for agriculture and basic human needs will significantly ratchet up tensions in this historically critical region.

These potential climate change effects will not just create crisis events happening far away from American soil or along our borders. Disasters like Hurricane Katrina in 2005 reveal, in a very stark way, how a natural disaster-caused humanitarian crisis can quickly lead to suffering, civil unrest and the need for a massive, expensive and sustained mobilization of resources.

As CNA Military Advisory Board member Vice Admiral Richard Truly said it is not like “some hot spot we're trying to handle.” “It's going to happen to every country and every person in the whole world at the same time.”

And while the effects of global warming create this environmental havoc, its principal dynamic will be to shift the world's balance of power and money.

Drought and scant water have already fueled civil conflicts in global hot spots like Afghanistan, Nepal and Sudan, according to several new studies. The evidence is fairly clear that sharp downward deviations from normal rainfall in fragile societies elevate the risk of major conflict.

Climate impacts like extreme drought, flooding, storms, temperatures, sea level rise, ocean acidification, and wildfires – occurring more frequently and more intensely across the globe – will inevitably create political instability where societal demands for the essentials of life exceed the capacity of governments to cope. As noted above, fragile governments will become failed states, and desperation and hopelessness will drive whole populations to be displaced on a scale far beyond what we see today. And this turmoil and power vacuum creates a more fertile breeding ground for extremists and the terrorism that can follow.

The U.S. Military will be called to respond to these new threats -- mobilizing to meet the needs of humanitarian crises, like our response to the 2004 tsunami in Indonesia. At the same time, we will be confronted with more frequent resource

based conflicts in the most volatile regions of the world. Climate-driven disruption is such a viable threat that the Pentagon has already started to prepare contingencies for such scenarios, and will focus on the issue in its 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review, as will the State Department in its Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review.

At the same time – and this is at the nexus of climate change, energy and national security – increasing demand for, and dwindling supplies of fossil fuels will add greatly to this instability, in many of the very same places worst hit by climate change.

In our second report, *Powering America's Defense: Energy and the Risks to National Security*, the CNA Military Advisory Board concluded that America's current energy posture constitutes a serious and urgent threat to national security – militarily, diplomatically and economically.

Militarily, our dependence on oil stretches our military thin because we are obliged to protect and ensure the free flow of oil in hostile or destabilized regions – even as our troops are on their third and fourth deployment in Iraq and Afghanistan. Protecting our oil dependence jeopardizes our military and exacts huge price tag in dollars and lives.

Beyond assuring the free flow of oil, our nation's, and our military's inefficient use of fuel adds to the already great risks assumed by our troops. It reduces combat effectiveness and puts our troops – more directly and more often – in harm's way.

Fuel convoys can stretch over great distances, traversing hotly contested territory and become attractive targets for enemy forces. Ensuring convoy safety and fuel delivery requires a tremendous diversion of combat force. As in-theater energy demand increases, more assets must be diverted to protect fuel convoys rather than to directly engage enemy combatants.

We saw this in Iraq and we are certainly seeing it again in Afghanistan where the tempo of military operations, the size of the force and its effectiveness is literally paced by our ability to get fuel when and where it's needed.

Outside the theater of combat, our country's dependence on oil undermines our foreign policy goals and US leverage because it entangles us with hostile regimes. The United States sent \$386 billion dollars overseas in 2008 to pay for oil; much of this money went to countries that are hostile to our interests.

This dependence cripples our foreign policy and weakens our leverage internationally and limits our options. Much too frequently we find ourselves entangled with unfriendly rulers and undemocratic nations, simply because we need their oil.

But unlike what many believe – it is not just foreign oil that jeopardizes our energy security. It is **all oil**. We simply do not have enough sustainable oil resources in this country to free us from the stranglehold of those who do. The Military Advisory Board concluded our dependence on **all oil** is a national security threat in part because the United States controls only 3 percent of the world's known oil reserves but uses over 25 percent of the world's oil supplies – we will never have enough domestic supply to meet our need for this fuel so we must deliberately and effectively wean ourselves from it.

And, our report concluded that it is not just all oil, but all fossil fuels that pose an unacceptable level of risk to our nation exploitable by those who wish to do us harm.

We identified a series of converging risks posed by our fossil fuel dependence.

Economically – it undermines our stability. As I noted earlier, our approach to energy is a key part of our current financial crisis. We are heavily dependent on a global petroleum market that is highly volatile. In the last year alone, the per-barrel price of oil climbed as high as \$140, and dropped as low as \$40. But this price volatility is not limited to oil – natural gas and coal prices also had huge spikes in the last year. The benchmark Central Appalachian coal price hit \$175 per short ton. While economic downturn has caused those prices to come down, they still remain high and will continue to climb again once the economy recovers. While these resources may be plentiful, they are increasingly difficult to access, and have associated local environmental impacts, such as slurry spills and smog. The economic and environmental costs are steep.

There are many who say we cannot afford to deal with our energy issues right now. But if we don't address our long-term energy profile in significant ways, beginning now – future economic crises will dwarf this one. The price shocks of 1973-74, the late 1970s/early 1980s, and early 1990's were all followed by recessions. If oil prices rose to \$200 per barrel, the U.S. would spend \$1.5 trillion per year on oil, which would be equal to 22% of take-home pay (for all Americans who pay taxes). In other words, the U.S. will be broke long before oil prices hit \$200 per barrel, and the rest of the world would be sure to follow.

The bottom-line is we can invest now in changing our energy posture or pay much more later, with far fewer options available. The current economic recession will end, U.S. energy demands will increase, and the volatile cycle of fuel prices will become sharper and shorter because the market for fossil fuels will be shaped by finite supplies and increasing demand. Continuing the United States' pattern of energy usage in a business-as-usual manner creates an unacceptably high threat level.

Unless we take steps now, not later, to prevent, mitigate and adapt to these challenges, the conflict over finite resources – from food to fuel – caused by rising energy demand and accelerating climate change will lead to a significant increase in conflicts, and in conflict intensity.

We need to carefully avoid the temptation to ignore these connections, and take only small steps to address narrow issues. Large, interconnected security challenges require bold, comprehensive solutions.

“We face,” as the late John Gardner once said “a series of opportunities brilliantly disguised as unsolvable problems.”

Members of the Committee, we must recognize we are at a pivotal moment in history, facing a Gordian knot unlike any the world has seen before. Those who say that now is not the time to act fail to recognize the gravity and urgency of our energy and climate change challenges – but they also fail to understand the **opportunity**.

There is a new multibillion-dollar revolution underway in clean technology around the world. And there is compelling evidence that clean energy policies are powerful economic drivers. Precedent setting statewide efficiency standards saved Californians \$56 billion – the equivalent of \$1000 per household – which were spent on goods and services, and created 1.5 million additional jobs. Energy efficiency – is the cleanest fuel that need never be mined, drilled or burned – and it represents a barely tapped resource that holds enormous power for all economies of the world.

The same is true for a whole host of clean and sustainable energy sources. There is general agreement that there is no “silver bullet” to meet our growing energy needs, however, there are a lot of “silver buckshot” that can be used to create a viable portfolio of future energy sources, not reliant on green house gas producing feed stocks and technologies. The United States can seize this opportunity to bring our great innovation, technology infrastructure and private capital to the forefront with the right kind of visionary legislation and policies.

Perhaps most important is the opportunity these challenges create for us to demonstrate, once again, the core values of America leadership to the world. How can we expect our enemies, or even our friends and allies, to understand the value of freedom and democracy if we are not actively engaged in protecting the essential water and soil required for its seeds? Ensuring that fragile democracies have the technologies needed to prevent, mitigate and adapt to climate change and for cleaner energy self reliance will help grow our economy and protect theirs. Most importantly, America’s leadership and key partnership in addressing these truly global challenges will act as a powerful catalyst for international collaboration to better address a whole host of pressing issues. The United States has an opportunity and obligation to lead. We can untie the

Gordian knot of energy, climate and national security – and lead to much greater global security.

Members of the Committee, if we act with boldness and vision now, future generations will look back on this as a time when we rose above narrow interests and partisan divides to address the most pressing issues of our time. Through thoughtful dialogue, effective leadership and united action, we can transform daunting challenge into sustained security and prosperity across the planet, creating a better quality of life for our nation and for our world.